

### ***REMARKS***

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-20, 24-28, 30-47 and 49 are pending in the present application. By this reply, claims 21-23, 29 and 48 have been cancelled. Claims 4 and 11 were cancelled previously. Claims 1, 6, 14, 24-25, 31-33, 40-41 and 46-47 are independent claims.

The specification and claims have been revised to correct minor informalities and to clarify the invention. These modifications do not add any new matter to the disclosure.

#### **I. Interview Conducted on October 18, 2001**

Applicant sincerely thanks the Examiner for a personal Interview conducted with Applicant's representatives on October 18, 2001.

#### **II. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection**

Claims 1-3, 14-19, 21-26, 30-38<sup>1</sup>, 40-42 and 45-49 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Kaloi et al* (U.S. Patent No. 5,511,000). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

---

<sup>1</sup> During the Interview on October 18, 2001, the Examiner pointed out that claims 31 and 32 should be treated as being rejected over *Koloi et al.* under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) although the Office Action of July 12, 2001 does not state so.

As agreed upon by the Examiner during the Interview on October 18, 2001, as set forth in Interview Summary (Form PTOL-413), *Kaloi et al.* does not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a data reproducing unit being detachable from a data recording unit or a data recording unit being detachable from a data reproducing unit, as in Applicant's claimed invention. Particularly, *Kaloi et al.* teaches as shown in Fig. 3 a single module 18C functioning as a data recording/reproducing unit. Further, *Kaloi et al.*'s data record/play back device (SSRPD) containing the module 18C is entirely disposed in a single, non-detachable device as shown in Figs. 3 and 5. Therefore, *Kaloi et al.* does not and cannot teach or suggest a data reproducing unit being detachable from a data recording unit or vice versa as required by Applicant's claimed invention.

Accordingly, the invention as recited in independent claims 1, 14, 24-25, 31-33, 40-41 and 46-47 and their dependent claims 2-3, 15-19, 26, 30, 34-38, 42, 45 and 49 is patentable over *Kaloi et al.* Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested based on these reasons.

### **III. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection**

Claims 6, 10, 20, 28, 39 and 44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kaloi et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,511,000) in view of *Young et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,479,266). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, *Kaloi et al.* fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a data recording unit/apparatus being detachable from a data reproducing unit/apparatus or vice versa as required by independent claims 6, 14, 25, 33 and 41 from which claims 10, 20, 28, 39 and 44 depend. Furthermore, *Young et al.* does not overcome this deficiency of *Kaloi et al.* because *Young et al.* is merely directed to a television schedule system for providing a program listing for a viewer's selection. Therefore, the combination of references as applied by the Examiner fails to teach or suggest the Applicant's claimed invention. Moreover, there is no motivation to modify *Kaloi et al.* to render the claimed invention obvious since none of the prior art of record teach this feature of Applicant's claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kaloi et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,511,000) in view of *Stockum et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,301,240). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, *Kaloi et al.* fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, "a data reproducing unit being detachable from said data recording unit" as recited in independent claim 1 from which claim 5 depends. Further, *Stockum et al.* fails to overcome this deficiency of *Kaloi et al.*, because *Stockum et al.* is merely directed to a high speed video instrumentation system for recording an

event. That is, *Stockum et al.* is completely devoid of a teaching for a data reproducing unit being detachable from a data recording unit.

Therefore, the combination of references as applied by the Examiner fails to teach or suggest the invention as recited in independent claim 1 and its dependent claim 5. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection based on these reasons.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons and in view of the above clarifying amendments, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw all of the objections and rejections of record, and earnestly solicits an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.


Should there be any outstanding matters which need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Esther H. Chong (Registration No. 40,953) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Applicant(s) respectfully petitions under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) and 1.17 for a one month extension of time in which to respond to the Examiner's Office Action. The Extension of Time Fee in the amount of \$110.00 attached hereto.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASH & BIRCH, LLP

By   
Joseph A. Kolasch  
Registration No. 22,463

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22032-0747  
(703) 205-8000

JAK/EHC:lmh